	Case 2:24-cv-03012-DAD-JDP Documer	nt 80	Filed 06/18/25	Page 1 of 3	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10					
11	CARBON AUTONOMOUS ROBOTIC SYSTEMS INC.,	N	o. 2:24-cv-03012-D	OAD-JDP	
12	Plaintiff,				
13	v.		RDER GRANTING O STAY THIS ACT	S PLAINTIFF'S MOTION CION	
14 15	LAUDANDO & ASSOCIATES LLC,	([Ooc. No. 78)		
16	Defendant.				
17					
18	LAUDANDO & ASSOCIATES LLC,				
19	Counter Claimant,				
20	v.				
21	CARBON AUTONOMOUS ROBOTIC SYSTEMS INC.,				
22	Counter Defendant.				
23]			
24	This matter is before the court on plaintiff's motion to stay this action while defendant				
25	obtains substitute counsel. (Doc. No. 78.) Specifically, plaintiff contends that a stay is				
26	appropriate because under the court's scheduling order as modified (Doc. Nos. 37, 55-1, 56), it is				
27	required to serve a disclosure of asserted claims and infringement contentions by June 20, 2025,				
28	////				

28 /////

but—because defendant Laudando & Associates LLC is currently unrepresented—"there is nobody on whom to serve such contentions and documents." (Doc. No. 78-1 at 2.)

"[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants." *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936); *accord Stone v. INS*, 514 U.S. 386, 411 (1995) (Breyer, J., dissenting) ("[W]e have long recognized that courts have inherent power to stay proceedings and 'to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.") (quoting *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 254); *Ernest Bock, LLC v. Steelman*, 76 F.4th 827, 842 (9th Cir. 2023). Deciding whether to grant a stay pending the outcome of other proceedings "calls for the exercise of judgment, which must weigh competing interests and maintain an even balance." *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 254–55.

In considering whether to grant a stay, this court must weigh several factors, including "[1] the possible damage which may result from the granting of a stay, [2] the hardship or inequity which a party may suffer in being required to go forward, and [3] the orderly course of justice measured in terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law which could be expected to result from a stay." *CMAX, Inc. v. Hall*, 300 F.2d 265, 268 (9th Cir. 1962) (citing *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 254–55); *see also Ernest Bock, LLC*, 76 F.4th at 842. A stay may be granted regardless of whether the separate proceedings are "judicial, administrative, or arbitral in character, and does not require that the issues in such proceedings are necessarily controlling of the action before the court." *Leyva v. Certified Grocers of Cal., Ltd.*, 593 F.2d 857, 864 (9th Cir. 1979).

The court concludes that the possible damage which may result from the granting of a stay here is minimal in light of defendant currently lacking representation. Furthermore, the court concludes that "the orderly course of justice," *CMAX*, 300 F.2d at 268, and considerations of "economy of time and effort for [the court], for counsel, and for litigants," *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 254, weigh strongly in favor of staying this action given that defendant is not otherwise able to proceed in this matter without counsel. *See* L.R. 183(a); *see also Abercrombie v. Vestra Labs*

	Case 2:24-cv-03012-DAD-JDP Document 80 Filed 06/18/25 Page 3 of 3				
1	LLC, No. 2:23-cv-01529-KJM-AC, ECF No. 21 (staying action where the corporate defendant				
2	was unrepresented to permit the defendant to obtain substitute counsel).				
3	Accordingly, plaintiff's motion to stay this action (Doc. No. 78) is granted. This action is				
4	STAYED through July 1, 2025 , to permit defendant to obtain substitute counsel by the deadline				
5	previously set by the court. (Doc. No. 75.) The stay will lift automatically on July 2, 2025				
6	without a further order of this court. The court directs the parties to file a joint status report				
7	regarding further scheduling by July 16, 2025. All other dates and deadlines are vacated.				
8	IT IS SO ORDERED.				
9	Dated: June 17, 2025				
10	DALE A. DROZD UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE				
11	ONTED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE				
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
2425					
2526					
27					
28					